



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,227	05/11/2005	Franco Codignola	0001824USU/2258	4406

27623 7590 07/05/2006

OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP
ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR
STAMFORD, CT 06901

EXAMINER

NWAONICHA, CHUKWUMA O

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1621

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/507,227		CODIGNOLA, FRANCO	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha		1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Priority

Applicants' claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4-20 are indefinite because they are improperly multiple dependent claims. Correction is required.

Claim 7 contains the trademark/trade name REILLEX™. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the

present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe RESINS and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim 20 is indefinite because of the phrase "stepof". Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boncheva et al., {Oxidation of Cumene in the Presence of Anion Exchange Resins, Neft i Khimiya, 1977, 11, 15-18}.

Boncheva et al. disclose applicant's claimed cumene hydroperoxide. Applicant has claimed a product by way of a product by process claim. The Examiner did not give any patentable weight to the process step.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Codignola, {US 3,171,860}.

Codignola discloses applicant's claimed cumene hydroperoxide. Applicant has claimed a product by way of a product by process claim. The Examiner did not give any patentable weight to the process step.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Codignola, {US 3,171,860} in view of Boncheva et al., {Oxidation of Cumene in the Presence of Anion Exchange Resins, Neft i Khimiya, 1977, 11, 15-18}.

Applicant claims a process for the synthesis of cumene hydroperoxide, comprising the step of oxidating cumene to cumene hydroperoxide in a liquid phase in the presence of an oxidating agent and of a basic medium insoluble and stable in the reaction environment, said basic medium being such as not to release inorganic cations to the reaction environment; wherein all the variables are as defined in the claims.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (M.P.E.P. §2141.01)

Codignola teaches a process wherein cumene is oxidized in a liquid phase in the presence of sodium salt at a temperature between 70 and 120°. See the claims in US 3,171,860.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (M.P.E.P. §2141.02)

Codignola's process for the synthesis of cumene hydroperoxide from cumene differs from the instantly claimed process for the synthesis of cumene hydroperoxide in that Codignola teaches a process that employs sodium salt while applicant claims a process that employs basic resin. However, the secondary reference of Boncheva et al. teaches a process for the preparation of Cumene hydroperoxide by the oxidation of cumene with air in the presence of a weakly-alkaline anionic resin. See abstract.

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (M.P.E.P. §2142-2143)

The instantly claimed process for the synthesis of cumene hydroperoxide would have been suggested to one of ordinary skill because one of ordinary skill wishing to obtain cumene hydroperoxide is taught to employ the processes of Codignola and Boncheva et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the instant invention by varying the process conditions (concentration of the reactants, reaction medium, temperature and pressure) from the teachings of Codignola and Boncheva et al. to arrive at the instantly claimed method for the synthesis of

Art Unit: 1621

cumene hydroperoxide. Said person would have been motivated to practice the teaching of the references cited because they demonstrate that cumene hydroperoxide are useful industrial raw materials. The Examiner notes that variation the reaction conditions, for example, concentration of the reactants, reaction medium, temperature and pressure in a chemical reaction is a well-known chemical practice to optimize the process efficiency of the system and does not constitute a patentable distinction. Therefore, the instantly claimed invention would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha whose telephone number is 571-272-2908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman k. Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/507,227
Art Unit: 1621

Page 7

Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 1621

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Thurman Page,
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Technology Center 1600